

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-11 were pending and rejected claims 1-11.

No claims have been amended. Claims 1 to 11 are requested to be cancelled. Claims 12 to 20 are requested to be added. No new matter is being added and support for new claims 12 to 20 can be found on pages 12 to 36 of the specification and in Figs. 1 to 11. More specifically, new claims 12 and 13 correspond to the subject matter covered by original claims 1 to 4 and the structures illustrated in Figs. 1 to 3 and Figs. 8 to 10 (first and third embodiments), and new claim 14 corresponds to the structure illustrated in Figs. 5 and 6 (second embodiment). Further, new claims 15 to 17 are method claims corresponding to device claims 12 to 14, and new claim 18 to 20 are computer readable recording medium claims corresponding to method claims 15 to 17. These new claims are presented mainly to clarify the language of the subject matter covered by the original claims and to expedite prosecution in view of the ongoing rejections.

Approval and entry are respectfully requested. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 to 20 are currently pending. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 3 to 11, numbered paragraphs 5 to 8, claims 1 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass et al. (US006629128B1; hereinafter, Glass) in view of O'Neil et al. (US006128279A; hereinafter, O'Neil), and further in view of Dugan et al. (US006425005B1; hereinafter, Dugan). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, claims 1 to 11 have been cancelled and new claims 12 to 20 have been added. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 12, 15, and 18 are directed to a device, method, and computer readable recording medium for generating a CORBA object reference. For example, in claim 12, a CORBA object reference generating device (Figs. 1 to 3; Figs. 8 to 10) comprises a request receiving unit (130; 420) which receives, via a server (40; 600) having a server IP address (IP3; IP8), a request for Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) naming service, the request being transmitted by a first client (51) to an arrival IP address; and a naming service unit (120; 410) which generates a CORBA object reference (OR1; OR4) including a

reference IP address, the CORBA object reference (OR1; OR4) being required for the first client (51) to access an object (110), wherein the naming service unit (120; 410) receives the request and connection information including the arrival IP address, determines whether the arrival IP address is a predetermined IP address (IP1; IP6), sets the server IP address (IP3; IP8) as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address (IP1; IP6), and sets an IP address other than the server IP address (IP3; IP8) as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address (IP1; IP6). (In these Remarks, the reference numerals have been inserted for intelligibility of the claims by way of example only and in no way limit the invention as defined by the claims.)

In contrast, Applicant submits that Glass does not teach a CORBA object reference generating device comprising: a request receiving unit which receives, via a server having a server IP address, a request for Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) naming service, the request being transmitted by a first client to an arrival IP address; and a naming service unit which generates a CORBA object reference including a reference IP address, the CORBA object reference being required for the first client to access an object; wherein ***the naming service unit receives the request and connection information including the arrival IP address, determines whether the arrival IP address is a predetermined IP address, sets the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets an IP address other than the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address***, as recited in independent claim 12 (***emphasis*** added) and similarly recited in independent claims 15 and 18 of the present application.

Further, Applicant submits that O'Neil and Dugan both fail to cure these deficiencies in Glass. Thus, nothing in Glass, O'Neil, or Dugan, or in any combination thereof teaches or suggests the subject matter recited in independent claims 12, 15, and 18. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 12, 15, and 18 are distinct and not obvious from the cited prior art references and any combination thereof. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12, 15, and 18 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of O'Neil, and further in view of Dugan.

Dependent claims 13, 16, and 19 are directed to the device, method, and computer readable recording medium according to claim 12, 15, or 18 respectively. As described above, independent claims 12, 15, and 18 are distinct and not obvious from the cited prior art references and any combination thereof. Further, the cited prior art references and any combination thereof fail to teach or disclose that the CORBA object reference generating device

(see Figs. 1 to 3; Figs. 8 to 10) further comprises a system structure information control unit (134; 424) that controls system structure information (J1; J4) that indicates a relationship between the predetermined IP address (IP1; IP6) and the server IP address (IP3; IP8), wherein the naming service unit (120; 410) refers to the system structure information (J1; J4) to make the determination and generate the CORBA object reference (OR1; OR4).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 16, and 19 are not obvious from the cited prior art references and any combination thereof. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome and claims 13, 16, and 19 are patentable.

Independent claims 14, 17, and 20 are directed to a device, method, and computer readable recording medium for generating a CORBA object reference. For example, in claim 14, a CORBA object reference generating device (see Figs. 5 and 6) comprises a request receiving unit (330) that receives, from a first client (71) connected to a first network (70), a first request for CORBA naming service, the first request being transmitted from the first client (71) to a first IP address (IP4) corresponding to the first network (70), and from a second client (81) connected to a second network (80), a second request for CORBA naming service, the second request being transmitted from the second client (81) to a second IP address (IP5) corresponding to the second network (80); and a naming service unit (320) that generates an object reference (OR3) including a reference IP address, the object reference (OR3) being required for the first or second client (71, 81) to access an object (310), wherein the naming service unit (320) receives connection information including the first or second IP address (IP4, IP5) and the first or second request for CORBA naming service, determines whether the first or second IP address (IP4, IP5) is a predetermined IP address, sets an IP address for load distribution as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address (IP4, IP5) is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets the first or second IP address (IP4, IP5) as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address (IP4, IP5) is not determined to be the predetermined IP address.

In contrast, Applicant submits that Glass does not teach A CORBA object reference generating device, comprising: a request receiving unit that receives, from a first client connected to a first network, a first request for CORBA naming service, the first request being transmitted from the first client to a first IP address corresponding to the first network, and from a second client connected to a second network, a second request for CORBA naming service, the second request being transmitted from the second client to a second IP address corresponding to the second network; and a naming service unit that generates an object reference including a reference IP address, the object reference being required for the first or second client to access

an object, wherein *the naming service unit receives connection information including the first or second IP address and the first or second request for CORBA naming service, determines whether the first or second IP address is a predetermined IP address, sets an IP address for load distribution as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets the first or second IP address as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address*, as recited in independent claim 14 (*emphasis* added) and similarly recited in independent claims 17 and 20 of the present application.

Further, Applicant submits that O'Neil and Dugan both fail to cure these deficiencies in Glass. Thus, nothing in Glass, O'Neil, or Dugan, or in any combination thereof teaches or suggests the subject matter recited in claims 14, 17, and 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 14, 17, and 20 are distinct and not obvious from the cited prior art references and any combination thereof. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 14, 17, and 20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of O'Neil, and further in view of Dugan.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited references, Glass, O'Neil, or Dugan, and any combination thereof, fail to teach or disclose the features of the present invention recited in claims 12 to 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 to 20 distinguish over the prior art and are not obvious from the cited references and any combination thereof. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of O'Neil, and further in view of Dugan is overcome and claims 12 to 20 are patentable.

SUMMARY

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 5, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501